	UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET

ID BOTTOM

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP

TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	DCI - 7 E 12		
2	OGC/LC - 7 D 07		
3			
4			
5			
6			

	ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY
	APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION
	COMMENT		FILE		RETURN
	CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE

Remarks:

Attached are two extracts from the Congressional Record of 22 January 1963, one containing Senator Keating's remarks on the Freedom Academy bill and the other Senator Goldwater's remarks on the Bay of Pigs.

STAT

John S. Warner

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER

FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.	DATE
OGC/LC - 7 D 07	23 Jan 63

UNCLASSIFIED | CONFIDENTIAL | SECRET

(40)
ITING OFFICE : 1961 O—587282

Carolina was on the floor. He is present; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF FINANCIAL HOLDINGS OF SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I made in writing to the Secretary of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO

Hon. FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary of the Senate,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: At the outset of convening of the 88th Congress, I file with you and publicly report my financial holdings. I have done this before. In my campaign for election in 1958, I made two promises to citizens in asking for their votes: (1) that I would make public my financial interests and personal finances so that anyone could judge whether or not any of my votes were cast for purely selfish reasons and against the public interest; and (2) that I would conduct myself at all times and always vote in accord with my judgment and conscience, giving no thought to political considerations; that no pressure groups would prevail and that this was the last public office I would occupy and I intended to try hard to be a good public servant.

I owned stock in sugar corporations, such as Cuban-American Sugar Co., Fajardo, Central Violeta & South Puerto Rico Sugar Co., and I have sold all stocks I owned in such corporations. In addition, I sold my stock in Pan American Airways, which corporation owns Cape Canaveral. I did this because of my membership on the Senate Committees on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and on Agriculture.

I make public a complete and correct statement of my financial holdings. I own real estate in Ohio, Mississippi, and Washington, D.C. Also, I have conveyed an oil lease on my Mississippi acreage, which may posssibly result in income. In addition to the real estate and stocks, I also own a modest amount of some U.S. Government bonds.

As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, I voted to reduce the depletion allowance of oil and gas producing corporations from 27½ to 15 percent. I have not changed my views. As Senator, I voted for an amendment to reduce this depletion allowance.

Some of the oil stock I own was purchased by me before I went oversea in World War II. Like other stockholders, I receive form letters and circulars along with dividends, urging me to write my Congressman, expressing views coinciding with those of the corporate officials. This is an additional reason causing me to feel I should make a financial disclosure. Obviously, circulars of this sort are not persuasive to me. With my views a matter of record, I knew of no reason for selling my stock in oil producing corporations.

I owe no banking institution or individual any unsecured loan. I owe to banking institutions two real estate mortgages and notes and this, and other secured loans I owe, total approximately $116,000.

I own the following shares of stock: 2,032 W. R. Grace & Co., 1,100 Airport Parking of America, 921 Monsanto Chemical, 809 Mission Development, 300 Sinclair Oil, 209 Robbins & Myers, 240 Martin Marietta, 200 Mission Corp., 100 Canadian Pacific Railway, 200 General Fireproofing, 160 Atlantic Refining, 200 Pacific Northern Airlines, 100 United Fruit, 100 Delta Airlines, 104 Socony Mobil, 131 Ashland Oil & Refining, 40 British Petroleum, 50 Rainbow Products, 42 Scurry Rainbow, 5 Getty Oil, 100 Lucky Stores, Inc., 200 DuBois Chemicals, 150 Radio Corp. of America, and 31 Tidewater Oil.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN M. YOUNG.

PROTECTION OF CITIZENS OF MAINE BY SENATOR SMITH

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in the years when we had a Republican President, I did not permit his being a Republican to prevent me from taking issue with him when I felt that he had not acted in the best interests of the people of Maine. One of the matters on which I disagreed with him was his action for the protection of the oil industry—when he placed restrictions on oil imports for the protection of oil interests here at home—but discrimination for oil interests in Texas and elsewhere at the expense of the people of Maine, who repeatedly are victims of high oil prices about which they can do nothing because they are a captive market.

With vigor, I criticized the Republican President. And in view of the recent action of the Democratic President restricting imports of oil, I am equally critical of this action which discriminates against the people of Maine, and I am critical with equally bipartisan vigor.

I speak of this today because our Nation is going through its coldest spell of this season and because prospects are that we will continue to have our coldest weather for the next 2 months.

I speak of it because I remember so well what happened in past years during such cold periods, of how fuel oil prices went up, of how the restrictions against oil imports lessened competition so much that the fuel oil prices could be easily raised in the coldest time of the year, when Maine people in a captive market could do nothing about it, could not convert to another means of heat, had no choice but to pay the raised fuel oil prices or go cold and risk their health and their lives.

It is said that what is past is prolog and that future actions can be predicted on the basis of past behavior. If this pattern should prove to be the case, then the people of Maine—and of the other captive market areas of our Nation—face the tragic possibility that again they will be at the mercy of the oil producers with hiked prices when they can do nothing but pay the hiked prices.

In this connection, I want to make it crystal clear that I refer to the oil producers—and not to the oil distributors—for the distributors are at the mercy of the oil producers. I know this because many of the oil distributors in Maine have expressed to me their own resentment of the price hikes that are forced upon them by the oil producers.

One of the reasons why I was so hesitant to vote for the trade expansion bill was the manner in which that legislation sacrificed the textile, shoe, and plywood industries of Maine but at the same time protected the oil industry of Texas and other States from foreign oil imports. It is true that the name of oil was not mentioned in the protective provisions of that legislation. But if you dug a little deeper than the surface words of that legislation, you found that very clearly oil was one of the commodities given protective exemption from the provisions of the legislation.

What is this power that the oil interests have which enables them to receive such protection to the detriment of fuel oil users? Why the protection against the foreign oil competition imports that could competitively bring the prices down—protection given by a Republican President and now by a Democratic President? Why protection for the millionaires in the oil industry, but no protection for the little textile worker and the little shoe worker?

In the face of a huge deficit, Congress has been asked to make a tax cut. But the emphasis appears to be on a tax cut rather than on tax reform. Why do we not close up some of the flagrant tax loopholes such as the 27½-percent depletion allowance that the oil millionaires enjoy? Why is tax protection and favoritism continually given to them, just as in the recent action of the President restricting oil imports for their protection and helping them keep their prices up?

Why all the evident concern and action for the oil millionaires? Why is not some action taken for the protection of the little man? Why not some protective action for the little people who hover around a fuel oil stove in the cold of winter after spending the precious small amount of money they have for fuel oil to keep warm and to survive the winter?

FREEDOM ACADEMY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very happy to join with Senator MUNDT and nearly a dozen other Senators in cosponsoring legislation to create a Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy. I enthusiastically support this proposal to create institutions to mobilize the United States for the continuing battle against international communism in all its forms.

From the time this proposal was originally put forward in the 86th Congress, it has had impressive, diverse, and bipartisan support. The senatorial cosponsors are a bipartisan group. The bill has the support of the AFL–CIO. It has always enjoyed tremendous public support among eminent professors and Soviet specialists, and it is backed vigorously by millions of Americans who see the increasing need every year for more effective techniques to combat the Soviet menace.

Mr. President, this year for the first time the State Department and the administration has recognized the deficiency in governmental training programs for personnel who must deal with the Communists and formulate our policies toward them. For the first time the State Department is itself moving toward a similar objective. The President's advisory panel, headed by James A. Perkins, of the Carnegie Corporation

of New York, has called for a National Academy of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. President, there is much in the Perkins report that I would applaud. It is anticipated that specific recommendations in the form of legislation will be sent to the Congress as soon as they are completed. The purpose of reintroducing this bill in a slightly revised form at this point is not to preclude consideration of other suggestions that may come before the Congress. Rather it is to permit a full study and hearing to be held on all relevant possibilities. For instance, specific questions have been raised as to whether this institution should be limited to college graduates if persons are otherwise qualified, as to whether training in such an institution should be limited to government personnel, as to whether citizens of foreign nations should be permitted to attend, and as to whether such an institution should replace or merely supplement the present Foreign Service Institute. These and other questions will have to be studied in some detail during the legislative process.

But the time has undoubtedly come, Mr. President, to acknowledge the need for an institution to prepare Americans to wage the kind of nonmilitary warfare at which the Communists excel. The Communists have long been experts in using political, psychological, economic, and technological weapons in their ambitious plan for world conquest. In the military field there is no doubt that our resources are as great as theirs—in fact, greater. But in these other nonmilitary areas they have a network of organizations and tactics that have been active for years. We, on the other hand, must mobilize ourselves more effectively to meet the many-pronged challenge of Soviet political warfare. The purpose of this institution would be to help American citizens, primarily in government, to develop the professional competence, experience, and knowledge necessary to meet the extraordinary variety of techniques employed by the Communists throughout the world. Prompt congressional action along the lines of this bill or similar proposals would constitute a long and important step in strengthening America's arsenal of nonmilitary cold-war weapons.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the U.S.S.R., as its propaganda boasts will affirm, is a party to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Article 18 of that declaration states:

> Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance.

Soviet actions belie this pledge. We have ample documentation of the Soviet treatment of one of its minorities, the Jews. This sordid evidence is detailed in an article by Moshe Decter in the January 1963 issue of Foreign Affairs Quarterly, published by the Council on Foreign Relations. It contains a dossier of Soviet perfidy that should be included in the files of all who would pin the lie on Communist pretenses of regard for individual and group rights. It reveals the extent of just one aspect of Soviet racism at a time when the Russians are making their strongest appeals to the newly emergent nations of Asia and Africa.

The following are some of the salient features of current Soviet anti-Semitism:

1. While there are over 100 nationalities in the U.S.S.R. which are granted the right to their own cultural institutions, their own schools, and their own language, the Jewish people—who are considered as members of the Jewish nationality by Russian law—are the only such group denied any semblance of nationality rights.

2. Jews who maintain their Jewish identity—and item 5 of all Soviet passports lists an individual's nationality—face increasing restrictions in educational and occupational opportunity.

3. While all the major religious groups in the Soviet are permitted regional or national ecclesiastic organizations so they might maintain contact with their people, only the Jewish religious groups are barred from official contact with one another.

4. Bibles, prayerbooks, and religious objects have been provided all other religious groups in the Soviet; these have, in effect, been denied Jews. In addition, while other faiths are truly permitted houses of worship, Jewish synagogues have been closed in community after community.

5. Synagogue leaders have been arrested on undisclosed charges. Jews are also being singled out in the Soviet press for so-called economic crimes and capital sentences are meted out to them in increasing numbers. As Mr. Decter points out in his article, a "policy of cultural and religious repression is conducted within the charged atmosphere of a virulent press campaign against Judaism."

These facts add up to a damning indictment of Soviet deeds as contrasted with Soviet words. While other nations, our own included, are called upon to answer charges of racism within national borders, the U.S.S.R., by the peculiar standard of international double morality which has too long been to its advantage, seems exempt from this obligation. It is incumbent upon the Soviets to disprove these charges or to stand before the world wearing the brand of racism which it has so eloquently decried in its own propaganda pronouncements. The Kremlin in the treatment of its Jewish minority clearly has one standard of morality for its own conduct and another higher standard for use in picturing itself to the world.

SOLICITATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES FOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there recently has been much talk, in the press and out, pertaining to the solicitation of Federal employees for contributions to political dinners. It was not the intent of the so-called Hatch Act to prohibit a classified civil service employee from voting as he pleases or even attending a dinner which might properly be labeled a birthday or party dinner.

It was and is the intent of the law to prohibit a public employee or anyone else from soliciting another public employee on public property for funds to such an occasion. Any such solicitation by a Federal employee, or by anyone else on public property, or elsewhere, which carries with it the slightest intimation that it might be best for the civil service employee to make a contribution, or to purchase tickets, is in my opinion a violation of the law.

If this procedure were permitted to continue, it could very well ruin the entire merit system.

One of the great privileges which has been mine has been that of working with the devoted Federal employees during my tenure in the Congress. To be able to watch the development of our excellent Federal merit system, and to have had a small part in its growth, is a source of satisfaction to me. I for one do not intend to remain silent when political leaders or others may in a mood of overenthusiasm pursue a course which might jeopardize the true working of our merit system.

Many excellent articles and editorials have been written recently in regard to the assessment by the Democrat National Committee of our Federal employees for the President's inaugural anniversary dinner.

Joe Young of the Washington Star has written an excellent article stressing the lack of concern on the part of employee organizations in behalf of their own members.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPLOYEE GROUPS' SILENCE VIEWED AS STRANGE IN $100 TICKET PRESSURE

(By Joseph Young)

Perhaps the strangest aspect of the entire spectacle of unashamed Democratic pressure on Government career employees to attend tonight's $100-a-ticket gala is the complete silence of Government employee unions and the National Civil Service League on the matter.

Not a peep has been heard from any of the major unions or the nonpartisan league, which came into being 80 years ago to uphold the merit system, since this reporter and the Star on December 6 first disclosed the pressure on career employees to purchase the $100 tickets.

The employee leaders appear too intent on such unattainable pie-in-the-sky objectives as a 35-hour work week, etc., to bother with the unprecedented pressure on career employees by the Democratic National Committee and officials of the Kennedy administration. Only the recently formed National Society of Federal Engineers, Scientists, and Allied Professionals have criticized the goings-on.

The unions' excuse is that not many career employees in the upper middle and top grades are members of their organizations, and hence they don't want to get into the fray. The long-range adverse implications on the merit system seem to escape them.

The silence of the National Civil Service League is even more puzzling. The main purpose of the nonpartisan business-supported league is ostensibly to protect and support the merit system.

The failure of Government employee unions to protest the situation may stem

ian nationalist feelings. The more oppressive was the hand of the government, the more the Ukrainians resented and rebelled against their overlords. As a result, Ukrainian nationalism was kept alive and became a powerful living force in the country. The idea of freedom was carefully nurtured in the people's hearts. And finally, some 250 years later, when the Ukrainians had the chance to regain their freedom toward the end of the First World War, they seized upon it and proclaimed their national independence. The day of that proclamation, January 22, 1918, has become a momentous landmark in modern Ukrainian history, and since then it has been solemnly celebrated as a Ukrainian national holiday.

The Republic which the Ukrainians founded 45 years ago was a frail and fragile being—young, weak, and beyond the reach of aid from its sympathetic friends and well-wishers. It was surrounded by powerful and dangerous enemies. All of them were prepared to pounce upon the new state and put an end to its existence. And the inevitable occurred in 1920: the country was invaded and overrun by the Red army and its independence shattered. Thenceforth the Ukraine became part of the Soviet Union and so it remains to this day.

Today Communist totalitarian tyranny has turned Ukraine into a large prison camp in which more than 42 million freedom-seeking and hard-working Ukrainians are crushed under the grinding steamroller of the Kremlin. There is no freedom of movement, and no freedom of expression. But the irrepressible free spirit of the Ukrainians refuses to be chained, and they retain their high ideals and nurse their national aspirations, even though they cannot celebrate their national holiday, their independence day.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this day, January 22, marks the 45th anniversary of the proclamation issued by the National Council at Kiev, declaring the Ukraine to be a free and independent Republic.

On January 22, 1918, after a long struggle with their Russian overlords, the Ukrainian people announced to the world that henceforth their fate would be determined by themselves. This, Mr. President, was an historic event. Since the mid-17th century the Ukrainians had slaved under Russian masters; now they would be free to enjoy the advantages of national freedom and personal liberty.

But, unfortunately, the citizens of this land had but a brief time—less than 3 years—to enjoy independence. In 1920, establishing a pattern which was to repeat itself in many of the smaller Eastern European nations, the Soviet Union coldbloodedly overran the Ukraine and proclaimed her people liberated. Mr. President, we know very well that "liberation" by the Soviet Union means the end of human lives and human liberty.

Subsequently the Soviet Union followed a consistent policy of premeditated colonialism in Eastern Europe. It usurped the right of self-government from the unlucky peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. It encroached upon the freedom of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Yugoslavia. Its blood-spattered tentacles turned Poland and Albania into slave states. Mr. President, these are only a few of many examples.

The Ukrainian people have suffered greatly under Communist rule. After the peasants refused to join the Soviet-established collective farms, close to 5 million people died in an enforced famine. Over 2,400,000 Ukrainians were forcibly deported to unknown parts of Siberia.

Mr. President, in my State of Pennsylvania there are a large number of people of Ukrainian birth or descent. I have had the good fortune to know many of these citizens, and understand their dreams, their dedication to their former homeland, their fervent desire to retain their colorful and centuries-old traditions.

The Ukrainians have never forgotten their national heroes. Many Ukrainian organizations and individuals worked hard for legislation—now public law—to authorize a statue in honor of Shevchenko, the famous Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter. I am told that the ground for the Shevchenko Memorial here in Washington will be dedicated during this year. We can all view with much inspiration this unquenchable desire by the Ukrainians to keep alive a national heritage.

Mr. President, I join my fellow Americans in bringing congratulations to the Ukrainian people and in the hope that the freedom we enjoy in the United States can become a way of life for all the lands now controlled by communism.

THE CUBAN INVASION FIASCO

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, now that Attorney General Robert Kennedy has opened for discussion the whole sordid story of the fiasco at the Bay of Pigs in the early days of his brother's administration, I believe the American people are entitled to a full airing of that situation conducted by persons not directly or indirectly involved in the invasion attempt. It is my considered opinion that the Congress of the United States is perhaps the only body that could properly weigh all the evidence available and provide a coherent explanation of what was planned and what actually occurred on that infamous day. I certainly feel that it is long past the time when every official report bearing on the invasion attempt should be made public.

Mr. President, I for one am not content to accept as gospel the highly colored account of the Bay of Pigs story as offered by the Attorney General in an exclusive interview. It strikes me as one of the most deliberate and flagrant uses of the news management devices yet attempted by the Kennedy administration. For, under the guise of news, the Attorney General is engaged in a massive readjustment of facts concerning the invasion attempt to place the New Frontier in a better light. This is plainly and simply a cleanup operation in public relations designed to make the worst mistake of the President's career seem like something entirely different.

The account of the Attorney General's explanation, as copyrighted by the Knight newspapers, contained numerous indications that Mr. Kennedy's whole view of the Bay of Pigs story was as superficial as it was erroneous.

For example, he says that the plan used in the invasion was "planned at the Pentagon in whatever manner they do these things." Now, it strikes me that the Attorney General—one of the two men appointed by the President to study the whole invasion failure—should by this time know in detail how the Pentagon goes about programing any military operation.

In another instance, the Attorney General says:

> One of the major mistakes in the American plan was the role played by three or four T–33 jet trainers at the Bay of Pigs.

These trainers were in the hands of Castro's men and, according to Mr. Robert Kennedy, the administration "underestimated what a T–33 carrying rockets could do." He told his interviewer, "they caused us a great deal of trouble."

Mr. President, I don't know how the invasion plan was programed at the Pentagon and apparently neither does the Attorney General. But it seems to me very strange indeed that anyone involved in the plan could have been surprised at what a T–33 jet trainer carrying rockets could do or could not do. Anyone connected with training in the Air Force could have supplied the information. A T–33 jet trainer carries a minimum number of 2½-inch air-to-ground practice rockets whose warheads contain only enough powder to mark the point of impact on a target. It stands to reason that this kind of rocket could not have caused the trouble. So, Mr. President, we have to assume that some other kind of air-to-ground rockets were used—that is, if we adopt the Attorney General's account. And these rockets could have come from only one of two sources, the Soviet bloc, or the United States. I certainly never heard that the Soviets were shipping this kind of equipment to Cuba at that early date, and I certainly would not like to think that the Kennedy administration had any hand in placing such dangerous devices in Castro's hands.

But if rockets carried by T–33's caused so much major trouble at the Bay of Pigs, let the Attorney General tell us what kind of rockets they were and where they came from. This is a highly important point if we take the Attorney General's story seriously.

But if we do not take it seriously—and I certainly do not as of this moment—then we have to recognize why the T–33's played such an important part in the Attorney General's postmortem. The motivation, quite plainly, is political. The purpose is to attach a major portion of the blame for the invasion fiasco at the feet of the Eisenhower administration. If we read the interview story carefully we will find that along with the Attorney General's lament about the trouble caused by three T–33 jet trainers a statement that the planes were given to former Cuban Dictator Batista and inher-

ited by Castro. This, of course, had to happen before the New Frontier came to power.

Mr. President, in the morning paper I read that our esteemed colleague, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], has said that the President's preeminent task is to educate and lead public opinion. I wonder if it follows that the Attorney General's preeminent task is to tamper with history and brainwash the American people into a belief that the New Frontier can do no wrong?

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII—CLOTURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to proceed to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 9) to amend the cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I rise to defend the rules of the Senate and to speak in objection to the ideas and concepts contained in the brief dated January 4, 1963, entitled "Memorandum and brief concerning the need for a new antifilibuster rule permitting a majority of the total Senate to close debate, and, supporting the proposition that the Senate of the 88th Congress has power to enact such a rule at the opening of the new Congress by majority vote, unfettered by any restrictive rules of earlier Congresses." This memorandum contains basic presumptions with which I cannot agree. I believe the entire basis of this memorandum is in error. For convenience I have divided my remarks in two parts in an effort to correct the false impressions created by this brief. First I would like to speak against the idea that this rules battle is nothing more than a civil rights squabble and a cloak behind which liberals are making a noble battle to assure our citizens a protection of civil rights. On the contrary, I intend to show, using previous debate and the positions taken by great Members in the history of the U.S. Senate, that exactly the opposite is true and that unlimited debate has been the bulwark behind which minorities have steadfastly stood to defend their rights. I feel very deeply that a close look at the history of the Senate debate on this question will show that this is not a civil rights battle, but one which goes to the very essence of our form of government. I feel equally deeply that the proponents of the change of rule XXII are misleading the public, the press, and many Members of the Senate on what this battle is all about.

My early remarks will cover a wide range including such men as La Follette, Borah, Calhoun, Townsend, Dawes, and many others. I believe a study in depth of the history of these men is irrefutable proof that the brief filed by the proponents on this rules change is based on fallacy.

Second, I shall discuss the second major premise of the brief, that is, that the Senate is nothing more than another House of Representatives, is not a continuing body, and only a simple majority is required to do anything to Senate rules they desire. This particular question has much historical significance and my opponents are not impressed by the most serious scholars and writers on this question. The position of eminent historians and textbook writers as well as the position in the courts, which I shall document in my talk, that the Senate is a continuing body, is dismissed as "dubious academic theory" which the proponents of cloture wish to subject to practical reality. To shed some light on the fallacy contained in this issue I will delve into the practical history of this body and court decisions on this question. I intend to show nothing could be more practical than the 175 years' practice which has given the Senate a wonderful set of rules into which the wisdom of nearly two centuries has gone. These rules must be protected against the onslaught of a temporary majority backed by numerous pressure groups. These are my sincere convictions. I have in the past made my position clear in my three terms in this body and I plead that this evidence and these talks will not be lightly considered by those of us presently enrolled in this battle. For 18 years I have held this same position.

Mr. President, I pointed out in 1961, and I would again like to bring to the attention of the Senate some aspects of this question frequently ignored by the proponents of a more rigid cloture rule of the Senate. I would like to point out that, contrary to popular opinion, we do not have freedom of debate at this time in the U.S. Senate, but, as a matter of fact, two-thirds of those Senators present and voting can require the other one-third, or a total representation of 16 of our sovereign States, to silently watch legislation they detest be passed by this body.

Unfortunately for those who sincerely feel that there are many legitimate reasons why the Senate should have unlimited debate, the American public has been led to believe that there is one reason, and one reason only, why a bare majority vote in the Senate cannot shut off debate, and that the only reason we require a two-thirds vote is because the southern Senators use feedom of debate as a weapon against civil rights legislation.

Mr. President, I can think of no greater disservice that could be done to the citizens of this country than to mislead them about one of our greatest institutions, and to place in their minds the mistaken concept that this battle which has been fought in the U.S. Senate ever since its inception is a civil rights struggle.

Mr. President, there are at least 10 very good reasons why the Senate should have unlimited debate, some of them, of course, much better than others; but each on its own merits a very valid reason for continuing this Senate as the last free forum in the world.

Mr. President, in an effort to shed some light on this subject that has been so clouded by the opponents of free discussion in the Senate, I shall list some of these reasons and discuss them in the hope that we can disprove the opposition's theory that this is merely a sectional civil rights battle.

Mr. President, one of the reasons why we have traditionally had unlimited debate in the Senate and have not resorted to the majority rule which prevails in most of our other institutions, is the very cogent fact that minorities have rights which no majority should be able to override.

The framers of our Constitution, having full knowledge of this fact, set up the Senate as a separate entity without reference to population of the States whatsoever, so that a simple majority of our population could not trample the rights of a minority. Unfortunately, some of our very largest minority groups who have temporarily gained majority influence over the Congress through bloc voting and propaganda efforts unwisely lose sight of the valuable contribution the Senate has made in the protection of the rights of these very minorities. Unbelievably at this particular time, they are among the most vocal advocates of a change in the very rule which so often has protected them.

Mr. President, another reason that the Senate does not have majority cloture is the realization that many times a majority of Senators do not represent a majority of the people of the United States.

Many times in the past Senators of the large populous States have fought against such changes as are proposed here today because, as they have pointed out, a coalition of smaller States representing a fragment of the population of our country, but a majority in the U.S. Senate could, with a simple majority vote, overwhelm the vote of the Senators of the larger States even though the senatorial minority represented by far a majority of the population, the wealth, and the tax contribution of the United States.

Unfortunately again, many of these Senators are at this time on the other side of this battle and now clamor for majority cloture, losing sight of, or ignoring the fact that their predecessors in their infinite wisdom not only established unlimited debate in the Senate, but fought vehemently to protect their right to speak out at length on any subject.

Mr. President, the advocates of simple majority cloture, in the Senate, which should be termed "gag rule," many times have pointed out that this is the last bastion of freedom of debate anywhere in the world, and have cited foreign parliamentary bodies as well as State senates of the great States of our own Nation as operating under rules which include the previous question rule or simple majority cloture. Each time this comparison has been drawn, the Senators fighting to preserve free speech in this body have pointed out, and I shall point out again, that very little parallel can be drawn between such institutions and the U.S. Senate.

First of all, the U.S. Senate has the unique duty of sitting in appellate capacity, so to speak, to carefully inspect